

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed April 16, 2007. Claims 73-92 were rejected and remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 73-77, 79-84, and 89-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obenhuber et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638 (hereinafter “Obenhufer”) in view of Farah M. (“Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol –UGGC/1.0”, April, 2000, Network Working Group) (hereinafter “Farah”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 73 recites in pertinent part, “responsive to said decrypting, said server retrieving the web page via the second Internet domain,” wherein the server is accessible via the first Internet domain, and wherein the second Internet domain is different from the first Internet domain. Applicant respectfully submits that Obenhufer and Farah, taken either singly or in combination, do not teach these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 73.

Obenhufer relates generally to a system for providing users with access to a network such as the Internet. Obenhufer teaches a multi-tenant unit that includes an encryption/decryption engine. The encryption/decryption engine encrypts each outgoing data packet and decrypts each incoming data packet. (Col. 4, lines 1-35). Thus, Obenhufer’s encryption/decryption engine simply encrypts and decrypts the data exiting and entering the multi-tenant unit.

Farah relates generally to a protocol in which both the URLs and the data traveling between a client and server are encrypted. Farah teaches that a WWW client sends an encrypted URL in a request to a WWW server. Upon receipt of the request, the WWW server determines what it is being asked to return, processes it, encrypts it, and sends it back to the client. (Section 2.3, “User/client/server interaction”, pp, 2-3).

These references, taken either singly or in combination, simply do not teach the limitations of, “responsive to said decrypting, said server retrieving the web page via the second Internet domain,” wherein the server is accessible via the first Internet domain, and wherein the second Internet domain is different from the first Internet domain. Accordingly, even if there were a motivation to combine the cited references as suggested by the Examiner (and Applicant does not concede that this is the case), the combination proposed by the Examiner lacks the features of claim 73 recited above.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 73 is patentably distinct over Obenhufer and Farah for at least this reason. Inasmuch as the independent claims 82, 84, and 89 recite similar limitations as those discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also patentably distinct over Obenhufer and Farah.

With respect to claim 73, Applicant further submits that Obenhufer and Farah do not teach the limitations of:

wherein said decrypted data includes a request for a web page accessible via a second Internet domain that is different from the first Internet domain, wherein said request includes both an encrypted address of said web page and an unencrypted address that is within a third Internet domain, wherein said third Internet domain is different from said second Internet domain;

With respect to these limitations, the Examiner states:

Obenhufer does not disclose wherein the request includes both an encrypted address of the web page and an unencrypted address of a third Internet domain that is different from said second Internet domain. However, Farah discloses encrypting the URL address or partially encrypting the URL address.

However, Applicant submits that Farah does not appear to teach a request that includes *both* an encrypted address of the web page *and* an unencrypted address that is within a third Internet domain, as recited in claim 73. Thus, neither Obenhufer nor Farah teach or suggest this limitation of claim 73. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 73 is patentably distinct over Obenhufer and Farah for at least this further reason. (If the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 73 based on this combination, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a specific explanation as to where Farah teaches the above-quoted limitation of claim 73.

Since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct over the cited art, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct, for at least this reason. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions not taught or suggested by the cited references. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant has petitioned herewith for what is believed to be the appropriate extension of time. If any further extensions are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6002-03300/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 16, 2007

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847